

# SmartAssoc: Decentralized Access Point Selection Algorithm to Improve Throughput

Fengyuan Xu, *Member, IEEE*, Xiaojun Zhu, Chiu C. Tan, *Member, IEEE*,  
Qun Li, *Member, IEEE*, Guanhua Yan, and Jie Wu, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—As the first step of the communication procedure in 802.11, an unwise selection of the access point (AP) hurts one client's throughput. This performance downgrade is usually hard to be offset by other methods, such as efficient rate adaptations. In this paper, we study this AP selection problem in a decentralized manner, with the objective of maximizing the minimum throughput among all clients. We reveal through theoretical analysis that the selfish strategy, which commonly applies in decentralized systems, cannot effectively achieve this objective. Accordingly, we propose an online AP association strategy that not only achieves a minimum throughput (among all clients) that is provably close to the optimum, but also works effectively in practice with reasonable computation and transmission overhead. The association protocol applying this strategy is implemented on the commercial hardware and compatible with legacy APs without any modification. We demonstrate its feasibility and performance through real experiments and intensive simulations.

**Index Terms**—AP association, wireless LAN, online algorithms, competitive ratio, minimum throughput maximization

## 1 INTRODUCTION

IT is already very common for wireless LAN clients like mobile phones and laptops to face multiple choices of APs because of the high-density deployment. Which AP to attach is not a trivial question, especially when there are a lot of nearby users who may interfere with one another. A user selecting an inappropriate AP will experience bad service, or even hurt other users' throughput. The current technique of AP selection is for the user to selfishly pick the AP with the strongest signal, or RSSI value. The intuition is that factors like multipath effect and path loss, which reduce network throughput, will have a smaller effect when the user is communicating with an AP with a larger RSSI.

This simple strategy might fail when there is a large number of users crowded together. Consider the case when we have two APs on orthogonal channels, one with much stronger signal strength than the other, and a collection of users. All the users will simply pick the same AP (with the largest RSSI), so that the actual throughput of each user is very small due to channel contention between users. Based on this observation, alternative criteria, such as selecting the AP which yields the largest throughput, have been suggested.

However, it is unclear how well this *selfish* strategy will perform when every user attempts to connect to the AP which is able to maximize their own throughput. Unlike an AP's RSSI value measured by a user, which is not affected by additional users associating with that AP, the AP's throughput will change as more users join in. Therefore, a user selecting an AP based on throughput may have to switch APs constantly, hence lowering overall performance.

In practice, we believe a good performance is to achieve the maximized minimum throughput for all clients. Using this simple but reasonable metric, we seek to design a practical distributed protocol for AP association. We theoretically analyze the worst case performance of the selfish strategy, and introduce an online algorithm that achieves a better worst case performance. An incoming user employing this algorithm determines an irrevocable association, only making use of the load information on the nearby APs, to minimize the objective, a function of the loads on all APs, at the moment. Based on our online algorithm, we have implemented an association protocol, SmartAssoc, for a commodity hardware driver at the client side. This protocol works well with current legacy 802.11 APs. Using a combination of real experiments and extensive simulations, we demonstrate that our online association protocol performs better than the RSSI-based and selfish AP selection.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- We have designed a distributed online algorithm for AP association. This algorithm well captures interference in transmission. It only needs to be performed once on a new user when she or he joins the network, and meanwhile, all the existing users do not have to revoke their association decision already made. We have proved that our algorithm is  $e \log m$  competitive, while no online algorithm is able to do better than  $\lceil \log(m+1) \rceil$  [1].

- F. Xu is with NEC Laboratories America, 4 Independence Way, Suite 200, Princeton, NJ 08540. E-mail: fxu@cs.wm.edu.
- Q. Li is with the Department of Computer Science, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187. E-mail: liqun@cs.wm.edu.
- X. Zhu is with the Department of Computer Science and Technology, Nanjing University, Jiangsu 210093, China. E-mail: gxjzhu@gmail.com.
- C.C. Tan and J. Wu are with the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. E-mail: {cctan, jiewu}@temple.edu.
- G. Yan is with the Information Sciences Group, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545. E-mail: ghyan@lanl.gov.

Manuscript received 9 Mar. 2012; revised 26 Dec. 2012; accepted 30 Dec. 2012; published online 10 Jan. 2013.

Recommended for acceptance by W. Jia.

For information on obtaining reprints of this article, please send e-mail to: tpsds@computer.org, and reference IEEECS Log Number TPDS-2012-03-0273. Digital Object Identifier no. 10.1109/TPDS.2013.10.

- Our implementation of SmartAssoc is practical and does not require any modification on APs, making our technique applicable to the existing wireless networks. A light-weight method is introduced to estimate one user's throughput on the target AP without association, reducing the operation overhead. We demonstrate the practicability of SmartAssoc in real experiments, as well as in large-scale simulation settings.

The remainder of this paper is as follows: We give an overview of the related work in Section 2, and explain our motivation in Section 3. Section 4 proposes our online algorithm as the association strategy for the protocol design of SmartAssoc, and characterizes its performance properties through theoretical analysis in a realistic model. We present the practical and efficient implementation of the proposed association protocol on the off-the-shelf wireless LAN adapter in Section 5. SmartAssoc is demonstrated through real experiments in Section 6, and simulation results are provided in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

## 2 RELATED WORK

AP association plays an important role in improving wireless performance [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [36]. The signal-noise ratios, which are popularly used for access point selection in 802.11, has been demonstrated as a bad idea by Judd and Steenkiste [13]. In their paper, some other criteria, like AP load information, are taken into consideration for improving the network performance and achieving load balancing. The metrics evaluating the AP load are interesting to both the academic community and industry. Vasudevan et al. [14] rely on the passive measurement of delay intervals between the time when a beacon is scheduled for transmission and its eventual transmission to estimate an AP's load. In [15], a combined metric is applied, which includes the number of stations associated, mean RSSI for the station set of AP and regular RSSI. A similar AP-assisted approach is proposed in [16], to give associated clients information about the load, through beacons. Compared with [12], we complete our theoretical analysis and conduct new real experiments in this paper.

The selfish behavior of users in a congestion game has been studied theoretically. A special case, where each user's decision is a singleton set, is considered in [17], while Milchtaich [18] describes a class of congestion game where the payoff function associated with each resource is user specific. The convergences under different load balancing scenarios are provided in [19]. In this work, we model the decentralized AP selection with selfish users as an extension of the weighted singleton congestion game, in which the weight of a user varies as the associated AP changes. Other modelings of the wireless infrastructure selection include [20] and [21], targeting at different scenarios and goals. The major distinction of our work is that we design and implement on the commercial chipset an online greedy AP selection protocol in a distributed manner. The performance is supported by theoretical proof and is demonstrated both in real experiments and simulations.

Compared with decentralized methods, the work by Bejerano et al. [22] and Murty et al. [23] uses the idea that better AP association decisions can be obtained by relying on a global view of the entire WLAN, or an extra centralized controller. An AP side system is modified in [23] to aggregate workload information and provide association control according to it. In [22], a more complicated central scheme for AP association is discussed. However, infrastructure change is required.

There are also other papers discussing how to multiplex multiple APs. In [24], it created multiple virtual interfaces based on one single wireless card, and made them simultaneously communicate with associated APs. The paper [25] built a multi-interface association mechanism to distribute a client's data traffic on multiple accessible APs, in a scenario where the backhaul link is the bandwidth bottleneck.

We take a practical wireless model that well captures the complicated interference among the APs and clients. Considering interference like Wang et al. [26] makes a great impact on the real-world performance of algorithms designed upon this model. From the technical perspective, the load balancing literature provides the foundation of our solution to the formulated problem of AP association. We borrow results from the literature [1], [27], [28], to better understand the hardness of our formulated problem. We elaborate on each work later when it is used. Load balancing also finds applications in other fields, such as wireless sensor networks [29].

## 3 SYSTEM MODEL AND MOTIVATION

We consider an IEEE 802.11 infrastructure network [30], in which there are  $m$  APs and  $n$  stationary clients or users. Given no central controller and global information, all the clients are allowed to freely choose an AP within the transmission range to associate with. Under this situation, our goal is to *maximize the minimum throughput over all clients*, taking both overall throughput and fairness into consideration. Throughout this paper, we consider the MAC layer throughput if not specified.

In the current IEEE 802.11 network protocol, a client is willing to associate with the AP that gives the strongest signal. We term this association strategy as Best-RSSI. However, the received signal strength indication (RSSI) is not a good indicator of throughput changes that a user cares about. Xu et al. [12] demonstrate this poor correlation between RSSI and throughput in practice. Since RSSI failed to reflect the actual performance of an AP, it is highly possible that many clients nearby may connect to the same AP, resulting in congestion.

For the sake of comparison, we introduce a widely used evaluation concept, *competitive ratio*. Competitive ratio is the performance ratio, with respect to some metric, between the worst outcome of a certain association protocol and the optimal strategy case. Here, we apply the competitive ratio in terms of minimum client throughput. According to the 802.11 standard, all clients connecting to the same AP share the same throughput. Therefore, the competitive ratio of minimum client throughput is also equal to the ratio of maximum AP load if we define an AP's

load,  $\mathcal{L}$ , as the reciprocal of its client's throughput (see Definition 1). In the above standard protocol scenario, this ratio can be as bad as  $1/m$ . When  $m$  is large, this plummeting performance becomes unacceptable.

Naturally, people may ask whether this problem can be solved if the current standard protocol directly utilizes throughput information instead of RSSI. To answer this question, we formulate a weighted congestion game where all clients are selfish and try to associate with any AP offering the best throughput for it in the whole network. The outcome of this game represents the best performance this alternative is able to reach in the ideal case. We prove that its competitive ratio is  $\Omega(m)$  and the whole network needs a long time to converge to this point, because clients greedily keep revoking their association decisions for better throughput. For details, please refer to the first section of the supplementary file, which can be found on the Computer Society Digital Library at <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/TPDS.2013.10>.

In the following section, we propose an online algorithm with competitive ratio  $O(\log m)$ , which is an exponential improvement.

## 4 ONLINE ALGORITHM

In this section, we introduce our practical online association strategy. Our online algorithm considers the communication load, including both interference and congestion, which provides a more realistic model.

For any user  $u$  and AP  $a$ , we use  $R_{ua}$  to denote the transmission rate under the situation where only  $u$  is associated with  $a$ .  $R_{ua}$  varies even for the same user. For the rest of this section, unless otherwise specified, the transmission rate refers to the effective transmission rate, which considers the overhead caused by retransmissions, random backoff, and so on. Then we introduce the load definition of an AP (see Definition 1). According to Lemma 1 (proven in Section 2 of the online supplementary file), maximizing the minimum throughput over all clients is equivalent to minimizing the maximum load over all APs.

**Definition 1.** The load of an AP  $a$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_a$ , is

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \sum_{i \in U_a} \mathbb{I}_{ia} = \sum_{i \in U_a} \frac{1}{R_{ia}},$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_{ia}$  is the reciprocal of the transmission rate of user  $u$  on AP  $a$ .

**Lemma 1.** All the users on an AP  $a$  have the same throughput  $T_a$

$$T_a = \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in U_a} \frac{1}{R_{ia}}}. \quad (1)$$

We merely assume that, when a new client joins the network, it can measure the loads of all APs within its hearing range. If the client does not affect an AP, or does so with negligible influence, it does not need to know the load on that AP. For example, if a client is far away from an AP, the interaction between them or the influence would be marginal and the client will not consider the information on that AP when it makes its AP association decision. We will show by implementation in Section 5 that this assumption

can be approximately achieved through a practical and low-overhead measurement method. We do not even assume how the loads will be changed when a client joins—although we do assume the load on each AP will be nondecreasing when a client joins. In the following, we examine several scenarios to show the ramifications of our assumptions and demonstrate how much our assumptions conform to the reality.

- *Interference with APs.* When client  $i$  joins the network, it might interfere with the transmission and reception on several APs. We denote the loads imposed on AP  $j$  after  $i$  makes its association decision as  $\mathbb{I}_{ij}$ . Note that  $j$  may not be the AP that client  $i$  associates with.
- *Interference with clients.* When client  $i$  joins the network, it might interfere with another client  $k$ . Even though  $i$  may not directly interfere with the AP (say AP  $j$ ) that  $k$  is associated with (possibly due to being out of the transmission range), the interference of  $i$  on  $k$ 's communication may change the load on AP  $j$ . If the load on AP  $j$  is visible to client  $i$ , this scenario is amenable to our analysis; otherwise, we will ignore the load imposed by this indirect influence, because the load change due to this rippling effect is marginal.
- *Myopic network configuration.* When a client  $i$  joins the network, it may not see all the APs due to the limited communication range. If the client does not see an AP, we assume the load change on that AP owing to the joining of client  $i$  is negligible. Furthermore, in this case, client  $i$  will not be able to associate with that AP, because there is no usable bidirectional link between the client and the AP.

In summary, we study a practical and complicated wireless LAN model. The weight (communication load) a user adds on the associated AP might vary as the local network configuration changes or new incoming clients appear. Additionally, an unknown number of new users may show up at any time. Therefore, an online algorithm is more suitable for this association situation.

*Online algorithm description.* Based on the above model, we propose an online AP selection algorithm that is simple without a complex interaction among clients and APs. It runs as below. When a new client appears (in an online fashion), it will make an irrevocable association with one of the visible APs, so that the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of the loads on all the APs within its transmission range, after its joining, will be minimized at the moment. Here,  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of loads  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \dots, \mathcal{L}_m$  is defined as  $(\mathcal{L}_1^p + \mathcal{L}_2^p + \dots + \mathcal{L}_m^p)^{1/p}$ . By following this operation, the whole network can achieve good proven performance that is independent of the number of incoming clients. Thus, reassociation is not necessary for all clients already joined to the network when a new client comes.

### 4.1 Performance Analysis

We first give a formal definition of the problem for the sake of quantitative analysis. In this realistic problem, we show that there is no constant approximation solution. Then we prove that the competitive ratio of our online

algorithm is  $e \log m$ , almost constant given a small number of APs in the network.

We first formalize this problem. Due to interference, a user may increase the load to other APs, in addition to the AP that it associates with. To capture such interference effects, we denote by  $\delta_{i,j,k}$  the increased load to AP  $j$  if user  $i$  chooses AP  $k$ . The generalized AP association problem (GAS) can be formulated as an integer linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{x}} \max_j \sum_{i,k} x_{i,k} \delta_{i,j,k} \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & \sum_k x_{i,k} = 1 \quad \forall i \in U, \\ & x_{i,k} \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in U, k \in M, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{GAS})$$

where  $U$  is the set of users,  $M$  is the AP set, and  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|U| \times |M|}$  is the association matrix with elements  $x_{i,k}$ . The two constraints force each user to associate with exactly one AP.

In the above problem definition, for a specific user  $i$  and an AP  $j$ , even if  $i$  is not associated with  $j$ , the exact load induced to  $j$  is dependent on which AP user  $i$  associates with. Specifically,  $\delta_{i,j,k}$  may be different from  $\delta_{i,j,l}$  for  $k \neq l$ . We do not assume any relationship between different  $\delta_{i,j,k}$ , only assuming that they are nonnegative (a new association will not decrease any AP's load). To see the difficulty of this problem, we should note that the input information can no longer be modeled by a bipartite graph.

In fact, this problem is a generalized version of the unrelated machine load balancing problem.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, all the hardness results of this classic problem trivially hold for our problem. Specifically, no polynomial algorithm can achieve a competitive ratio less than  $3/2$ , unless  $P = NP$  [28]. No online algorithm can achieve a competitive ratio less than  $\lceil \log(m+1) \rceil$  [1].<sup>2</sup>

The load balancing problem is able to be solved with constant approximation by linear relaxations [27], [28], but these two techniques are not effective in our case. The work in [27] is not applicable to our problem. It requires sorting the users by their loads to the same AP, while in our case, one user may contribute different loads to the same AP. The algorithm in [28] is applicable to our problem, but it is  $\Omega(m)$ -competitive, not a constant approximation algorithm, as shown in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *To solve problem GAS, algorithm [28] is  $(m+1)$ -competitive where  $m$  is the number of APs. The bound is almost tight in that there exist a class of GAS instances that the algorithm gives  $m$ -competitive solutions.*

The proof is presented in Section 2 of the online supplemental file, which is available online. The main factor leading to this result is the multidimensional nature of GAS.

1. Unrelated machine load balancing is defined as that of distributing  $n$  independent jobs among  $m$  machines to minimize cost like makespan.

2. Their work considers a special case of unrelated machines. The machines have identical speed but each user can only select a subset of the machines. This case can be easily encoded by our model.

Since the known constant approximation algorithms in load balancing literature fail to provide a constant approximation guarantee for our problem, it is natural to ask whether a constant approximation algorithm exists. Answering this question leads to the work of Zhu et al. [31], and we report it in a separate work due to independent interest.

**Theorem 2 ([31]).** *For any constant  $c > 1$ , there does not exist a polynomial time algorithm that is  $c$ -competitive for GAS, unless  $P = NP$ .*

In this work, we are more interested in online algorithms, since users in a wireless network may come at any time. Currently, one of the best online algorithms for load balancing on unrelated machines is due to [32]. Their solution is  $e \log m$ -competitive. We show in the following that this algorithm is still applicable to our problem. More importantly, we prove that the competitive ratio is still  $e \log m$ . This result is surprising in that 1) the competitive ratio is irrelevant of  $\delta_{i,j,k}$ ; 2) the generalization does not increase difficulty for online algorithms. In addition, this competitive ratio is not far from the best we can do (up to a multiplicative constant  $e$ ) for an online algorithm, since no online algorithm can do better than  $\lceil \log(m+1) \rceil$ , as mentioned before.

Since the client is unable to affect the other APs that are not in its hearing range, this algorithm will minimize the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of all the APs' loads in the system ( $\mathcal{L}_1^p + \mathcal{L}_2^p + \dots + \mathcal{L}_m^p$ )<sup>1/p</sup> in each new association event. Then we have:

**Theorem 3.** *If the protocol is to minimize the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of the loads (rather than to minimize the maximum load), then the online protocol gives a  $r \leq \frac{1}{2^{1/p}-1}$ -competitive ratio.*

The proof is presented in Section 2 of the online supplemental file. The intuition is that a suboptimal solution is achievable in the end by making the local-optimal association decision for each user that comes in the online manner.

It is worth mentioning that the competitive ratio in Theorem 3 is for minimizing the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of the loads. We need to transform this competitive ratio for minimizing the maximum load. Additionally, we need to find a  $p$  that gives a reasonable competitive ratio. This is done by the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** *The online protocol is an  $e \log m$  competitive protocol for minimizing the maximum load (or  $\frac{1}{e \log m}$ , w.r.t. maximizing the minimum throughput). This is obtained by setting  $p = \ln m$  in the online protocol.*

The proof is presented in Section 2 of the online supplemental file.

Instead of being related to the number of APs and the ratio between the maximum and minimum rates, the competitive ratio of this protocol is linear to the logarithm of the number of APs, an almost constant competitive ratio for a small number of APs. This is deemed very promising, since a constant competitive ratio algorithm usually gives a very good practical performance.

Furthermore, this algorithm has the advantage of computational simplicity and feasibility for practical

implementation. The expected performance bound, for each client joined, is ensured just by the local network information at the moment it was coming as a new client. It is not necessary to reconsider its decision once a new association event occurs. In other words, our online algorithm takes exactly  $n$  steps to finish. In the next section, we demonstrate that this algorithm can be employed as a practical and light-weight association protocol for off-the-shelf wireless LAN adapters.

## 5 PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION OF SMARTASSOC

In this section, we describe how to efficiently realize SmartAssoc with low costs. Although aforementioned online algorithm is carefully designed to avoid large overhead caused by the measurement of  $nm^2$  input parameters  $\delta_{i,j,k}$ ,<sup>3</sup> SmartAssoc still needs to address a real-world issue before we apply it in practice. That is how to estimate APs' loads within a short time frame. It should not require any modification at the infrastructure side, so our implementation can be used in any open 802.11 networks or networks the client is able to access. To solve this problem, we propose a distributed light-weight AP load probing method in our SmartAssoc implementation, so that message exchanges between users and/or APs are not necessary. The load information is obtained by the user from target AP without association.

We consider the scenario that a wireless link is the bottleneck of a communication connection. The discussion of other cases is out of the scope of this paper. Thus, the workload of an AP is reflected by the wireless traffic on air for this AP. Here, we monitor the uplink stream traffic, while ignoring the downstream, because accuracy improvement of throughput measurement is small compared with the extra complexity in the implementation experience of [25]. Every channel is considered to be interference-free with others, as this type of interference is ignorable compared to interference inside the channel. Thus, the computation of the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm of the AP's workload can be reduced to per-channel-based computation, while the comparison is still among all channels.

The implementation of SmartAssoc is taken on the popular commercial wireless LAN adapter by taking advantage of the legacy standard 802.11 protocol. User space control is provided by the click modular router toolkit [33], while association functionality of the MadWifi driver v0.9.4 [34] is directly taken over by SmartAssoc in the monitor model.

As mentioned above, SmartAssoc requires to measure every AP's load on the same channel when a client  $i$  joins a candidate AP  $j$ .<sup>4</sup> A natural way to obtain this information is to let the client  $i$  perform an association operation with  $j$ , and generate traffic on  $j$  while at the same time capturing an uplink data stream for each AP by passive listening. The packet retransmission and duplication do not count.

3. According to the online algorithm, an incoming user only needs to measure the resulting aggregate loads at APs. For example, during the  $i$ th user's association, it checks all APs to find the best one. If it checks AP  $k$ , then he needs to measure  $\delta_{i,j,k} + \sum_{i',k'} x_{i',k'} \delta_{i',j,k'}$  at all AP  $j$ , where  $i' = 1, \dots, i-1$  are the previous users and  $x_{i',k'}$  indicate their associations. This measurement can be done without measuring  $\delta_{i,j,k}$  separately as illustrated in the rest of this section.

4. Assume  $i$  always has some communication demand after association.

However, the association process consumes a lot of time, especially for encrypted wireless networks. When the set of association candidates is not small, the user is not able to bear waiting so long. Nevertheless, sending data packets without association will lead to rejection from the object AP because of the IEEE 802.11 standard. Thus, we find a more light-weight way to obtain the equivalent load information without association. Currently, 802.11 standards require an AP to respond to *probe requests*, even if the request is sent by a station not associated with the AP.<sup>5</sup> We leverage this to create a packet type to replace the real data packet in the MAC layer. The intuition is to generate modified probe request traffic to the object AP  $j$ , similar to the data traffic, to estimate other APs' loads as if the client  $i$  is associating with  $j$ . The detail modifications of the probe request packet are made as follows:

- We make the probe request unicast, forcing the target AP to return an ACK upon receiving the packet. This behavior is similar to a station transmitting data packets to an AP. And this process is important as well for calculating the throughput.
- We change the subtype flag in the packet header to prevent the AP from returning a probe response, to avoid introducing unnecessary traffic to the network.
- The packet size, transmission rate, and interarrival time of modified probe requests are packet-wisely customizable by the user, which provides more accurate throughput information for specific estimation based on upper layer applications. This feature is implemented in the probing generator module. Its performance is shown in the next section.

We also implement an AP filter to make the candidate AP list programmable. The user can select a preferred channel, network, and minimal RSSI threshold to customize the list. Only qualified APs will be considered for estimation to reduce overhead.

The implemented protocol is described as pseudocode (see Algorithm 1). A list of candidate APs is determined in the first place for estimation according to the beacons. In the list, the candidates from the same channel  $i$  group as a set  $\mathcal{C}_i$ . For each target AP  $j$  in  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , the user injects a probing traffic, which consists of modified probe request packets, to the AP  $j$ , while measuring all members' loads. After these measurements, the user can calculate the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm loads for all members within this channel set,  $(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_i} \mathcal{L}_k^p)^{1/p}$ , where  $p$  is the natural logarithm of the number of APs. This  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm value, influenced by association with the target AP, will be compared with the current best candidate AP among all channels. The comparison strategy applied in the best candidate updating stage is controlled through two programmable parameters. The first one is the norm-difference threshold  $T_{nd}$ , and the second one is RSSI-difference threshold  $T_{rd}$ . If the norm for the target AP are at least  $T_{nd}$  smaller than the norm for the current best AP, the target AP will be the best candidate AP instead of current one. Otherwise, the algorithm continues to check whether this

5. It is done automatically by the firmware, transparent to the upper layers.




Fig. 1. Upper-layer application stream emulations.

norm is just smaller than the current best candidate's, as well as whether the target AP's RSSI is at least  $T_{rd}$  more than the best candidate's. If so, the target AP will be the best; for all other cases, we keep the current best AP without updating. The user treats every member of a channel set as the target member, respectively, and repeats this process for each channel set. After the evaluation of all candidate APs, the user will associate with the final best candidate AP.

#### Algorithm 1. SmartAssoc Protocol Description.

```

Discover all available APs
Apply the filter on discovered APs
Put all filtered APs into candidate list
for each  $C_i$  do
  for each AP  $j$  in  $C_i$  do
    Generate a probing traffic to  $j$ 
    Estimate the new load of each AP within  $C_i$ 
    Calculate the  $\mathcal{L}_p$  norm change
    Update the best candidate AP according to  $T_{nd}$ 
    and  $T_{rd}$ 
  end for
end for
Associate with the best candidate AP

```

## 6 EVALUATION

We verify the feasibility of our online algorithm and demonstrate the performance of SmartAssoc implementation in this section. Each client is powered by a 1.66-GHz CPU with 1-GB RAM, running on Linux kernel 2.26.24. A D-Link WNA-2330 with Atheros 5312 chipset wireless card is used.

### 6.1 Application Aware Probing

Since our modified probing stream, used to emulate the real data stream, is programmable in terms of the packet size, interarrival time, and transmission rate, it is easy to generate specific streams to mimic the data stream of a certain application. Thus, the client is able to find out the "best" association AP, with respect to the application it wants to use. Fig. 1 demonstrates how similar our probing can be to the secure copy (SCP) and VoIP protocols, respectively. The SCP protocol used is the Unix *scp* command line program. SCP transfers a single file from a laptop to a remote desktop on the Internet through a commercial AP on channel 6 with RSSI  $-58$  dBm. The packet size of the probe emulating SCP is 1,500 bytes, and the interarrival time is presented at the right of Fig. 1. On the left side of Fig. 1, we choose Skype as the VoIP




Fig. 2. Calibration experiments for Atheros 5212 chipset.

application to set up a communication between two laptops through the same commercial AP on the channel 1 with RSSI  $-33$  dBm. The probing packet used in this experiment is 200 bytes on average. For both experiments, we first brought up our driver module to create virtual interfaces in the kernel for all upper layer applications. Then a script was executed to associate with the target AP in each experiment. After association and IP assignment, we ran the application and our probing generator to generate the traffic, respectively. The traffic traces are captured by Wireshark for cumulative distribution function (CDF) calculation of the interarrival time. In these two experiments, the transmission rate for all streams is fixed at 36 Mbps.

### 6.2 Measurement Accuracy

The APs' load information needed in SmartAssoc is derived by monitoring the wireless channels. Although it is not necessary for monitoring to capture all packets on the air, a relatively accurate measurement can help to make a better association decision. Thus, we conducted a series of experiments to investigate the capture missing, which is the main factor causing the measurement error of the load. In this paper, we are focusing on the Atheros 5212 chipset, while other chipsets can be easily studied like this as well. We set up two laptops with a distance of 10 feet between them. One is the target laptop, which is used to generate a data stream for measurement. The other laptop acts as the monitor to estimate the data throughput from the target laptop. To make our experiment comprehensive, we use different transmission rates when transmitting the data streams. The rates used are 1, 2, 5.5, 11, 18, 36, and 54 Mbps. We also use different interpacket times of 5, 10, 15, and 20 ms at each rate, respectively. The packet size in all trials is 1,000 bytes, and every trial lasts 5 s for data stream generating and capturing. The experiment results are shown in Fig. 2. The  $x$ -axis presents the captured packet number in each trial at the monitor laptop side, while the  $y$ -axis presents the number of transmitted packets counted at the target laptop side. It is clear that if there is no error, all points (star or circle) should fall on the green dash line  $y = x$ . Based on these experimental results (excluding the six outliers), we are able to calculate the best linear fitting by using the least-squares method, which is shown as the red line,  $y = 0.8806 \times x$ . 0.8806 is used for estimation calibration with respect to the Atheros 5212 chipset, i.e.,  $estimation = \frac{measurement}{0.8806}$ .

### 6.3 Measurement Duration

The long measurement time of channel traffic, although it benefits the accuracy of workload estimations, extends the delay time before associations and consumes more power.




Fig. 3. The estimation of workloads generated by two traffic patterns following exponential distributions with mean of  $\frac{1}{973}$  and  $\frac{1}{751}$ , respectively. The X-axis is different traffic measurement time from 0.001 to 2 s. The Y-axis is the estimated workloads in packets per second.

Thus, we conducted experiments to find out what is the minimum measurement duration, given certain measurement error. To facilitate experiments, we implemented a testing program based on `libpcap`. It has two functionalities. The first one is a standalone component of AP workload estimation described in our protocol. The second one is a wireless traffic generator that can assemble 802.11 packets of our choice and transmit them at given traffic patterns. Two laptops installed this testing program are set in 5.18 GHz of 802.11a. One of them is used to generate a traffic to one AP set in the same channel. The interarrival time of generated wireless traffic follows the exponential and normal distributions, respectively. The other one is to estimate this AP's workload in different time windows. The experimental results are illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4. We found out that 50 ms is a proper duration that can achieve less than 3 percent estimation errors.

#### 6.4 Comparison Experiment

We conduct an experiment to compare our association method of SmartAssoc with other practical ones, the Best-throughput and Best-RSSI strategies. Best-throughput here is one special case of the selfish strategy, of which the convergence speed can be bad. It means every client will make an irrevocable association decision to maximize its own throughput. In the experiment, there are three APs consisting of an *extended service set* (ESS) and four wireless LAN clients. Two of the APs (AP-1 and AP-3), whose process capabilities are relatively stronger than the thirds, are set in channels 1 and 11, respectively, and the third one (AP-2) is set in channel 11 as well. Three of the four clients, STA-1, STA-2, and STA-4, are put close to each other. Detailed settings are shown in Table 1.

The experiment includes four trials. In each trial, clients came to join the ESS one by one by using the same association strategy. It is reasonable because that, in the real world, the time to perform the association operation is statistically much smaller than the interarrival time between




Fig. 4. The estimation of workloads generated by two traffic patterns following normal distributions. In the left figure, the mean of distribution is 961 with a standard deviation of 1, while in the right one, the mean is 964 with a standard deviation of 4. The X-axis is different traffic measurement time from 0.001 to 2 s. The Y-axis is the estimated workloads in packets per second.

TABLE 1  
Comparison Experiment Settings

APs				
ID	Model	Channel		
AP-1	LinkSys WRT54G	CH 11		
AP-2	D-Link DL-713P	CH 11		
AP3	LinkSys WRT54G	CH 1		
Clients				
ID	Adapter	Pkt payload (byte)	Inter-pkt time(ms)	Transmission rate(Mbps)
STA-1	internal	1000	5	2
STA-2	internal	1000	5	11
STA-3	external	1000	5	11
STA-4	external	1000	5	11

new users, so the possibility that two clients will want to join the ESS at the same time is low. After joining, the client will generate traffic using the configuration in Table 1 to the associated AP. A trial was repeated three times, one for each association strategy.

The minimum client throughput for each strategy in the four trials are presented in Fig. 5. Our algorithm performs better than the other two because it can balance the APs' workloads and reduce the interference among all wireless nodes. The performance of the Best-throughput is unstable, and it also indicates that the selfish strategy cannot compete with ours under similar overhead costs. Meanwhile, the Best-RSSI strategy often makes all clients associate with the same AP.

#### 6.5 Overhead

All three protocols mentioned above need an AP discovery phase. However, Best-RSSI does not have any other overhead, whereas Best-throughput and our protocol need extra time to evaluate every discovered AP. For each channel, our protocol only spends a small amount of time on the channel measurement, compared with the Best-throughput one. Nevertheless, the Best-throughput protocol requires real deassociation and reassociation operations, including the IP assignment, before every measurement. These operations consume a lot of time, from 3 to 8 s. When the AP number grows, the Best-throughput protocol spends much more time than ours. Therefore, the overhead of the selfish protocol, which is equivalent to multiple runs of the Best-throughput protocol, is even worse. Thus, our protocol is the most efficient one.

We further examine the systematic impact of our implementation on mobile devices in terms of energy consumption and time overhead. SmartAssoc protocol is




Fig. 5. Comparison experiment results.




Fig. 6. Energy consumption experimental setting.

performed on the smartphone that is one of most energy-constrained mobile devices, and at the same time energy cost is monitored by external power meter (see Fig. 6). Experimental results show that the power consumption of the probing traffic is 1,186 mW on average. If SmartAssoc spends 0.5 second on one AP probing, the energy cost is only 0.003 percent capacity of a typical 1,500-mAh smartphone battery. The user might not notice this delay if SmartAssoc is triggered with the AP scanning procedure of 802.11 right after the wake-up of the phone.

## 6.6 Scalability

Scalability is the capability of a protocol to handle the scenario of a growing network, i.e., more users and APs. Unlike the centralized approach, the online algorithm applied in our protocol runs independently on each client and does not need any assistance or collaboration from each others, so more users will not introduce more extra overhead compared with a less-user case. Besides, no workload pressure is added to the infrastructure since there is no central server behind the network. According to our algorithm design, the client makes its association decision only based upon load information of APs within its transmission range. Therefore, more APs do not mean more complicated association procedure from the perspective of a client. Additionally, newly joined clients will not affect any already associated client, avoiding decision revocations that introduce complexity and overhead.

Our implementation also makes the association protocol scalable. There is no extra cost on the infrastructure compared with a standard 802.11 network, and users still can use their commercial chipsets. We also present the simulation results of our protocol in larger network settings in the next section.

## 7 SIMULATION RESULT

We use simulations to evaluate our association protocol SmartAssoc on a larger scale with more wireless nodes and various configurations. We use NS2 version 2.33 as our simulator. The multiple channel feature is patched into the NS2 wireless portion following the instructions of [35]. The MAC layer type is 802.11, while the radio propagation model is two-ray-ground. Ad hoc routing protocol is disabled since we are focusing on the infrastructure type of wireless LAN. The RTS/CTS mechanism is also disabled. The data traffic for users is a UDP stream with a packet size of 1,000 bytes and average interarrival time of 1 ms. The transmission rate is set to 11 Mbps. The selected channels include 1, 4, 5, 6, and 11 for covering the orthogonal and

adjacent channel cases. The throughput measurements are between the wireless nodes.

We implement the following three practical association protocols for comparison:

1. *Online*. This is our proposed online algorithm in SmartAssoc. It is implemented as described in Algorithm 1.
2. *Selfish*. The behavior of *Selfish* is that every client always has the incentive to change its association decision if it can find an AP providing higher throughput than the current one. Since the convergence speed of selfish strategy can be very bad, we demonstratively run the protocol for five rounds. In the first round, the clients come to join the wireless LAN one by one. Each client will associate with every AP to measure the UDP throughput and pick the one who is able to offer the highest value. In each of the next four rounds, every client will repeat the above process to adjust its association based on current wireless LAN association topology. Finally, every client will keep its association with the AP it picks in the last round.
3. *Ideal*. This is the globally optimal association solution in terms of maximizing the minimum throughput over all clients. *Ideal* is obtained by enumerating all possible association topologies, given a specific scenario setting only including the location and channel assignment information. In the real world, it is not practical because of its complexity.

Every experiment conducted below consists of a number of trials. Each trial has its own scenario configuration. The configuration is randomly generated, providing locations of all wireless nodes and APs' channels. Every throughput measurement, no matter whether it is for a data stream or probing stream, takes 3 s in the simulation.

The first simulation is to study the competitive ratio of *online* compared with *ideal* from the perspective of empirical experiments. The experimental value of the competitive ratio is a good indicator of the performance gap on average between *online* and *ideal*. This simulation also illustrates the statistical stability of the *online* method. We randomly picked 50 scenarios for testing. For every scenario, the competitive ratio in terms of the minimum client throughput, shown in Fig. 7, is calculated based on the test result of *online* and *ideal*. The theoretical upper bound is also provided for comparison. The simulation results show that about 86 percent of competitive ratio is above 0.47, and 70 percent is quite stable, just around 0.5. The worst competitive ratio among these 50 trials is 0.313, while the theoretical upper bound, computed from  $\frac{1}{e \log m}$ , is 0.232.

Next, we conducted a scale-up comparison simulation between *online* and *selfish*, which includes three experiments to show the performance in large scale deployments. In the first experiment, there are 10 clients and 3 APs within a rectangle of  $30 \times 30$ , the second one has 20 clients and 6 APs located in a rectangle of  $90 \times 90$ , and 30 clients and 9 APs are involved in the third experiment within a rectangle of  $150 \times 150$ . Each experiment ran 30 trials. For each trial scenario, both our strategy and the selfish strategy were applied for the association processes of all clients on this setting, respectively. After finishing all users' association processes, we measured the UDP traffic throughput for every client and found the minimum,




Fig. 7. Competitive ratio results, w.r.t. minimum client throughput, for five clients and three APs within  $20 \times 20$ . The simulation repeated 50 times with different configurations.




Fig. 8. Simulation result for 10 clients and 3 APs within  $30 \times 30$ . The simulation repeated 30 times. Each bar is the representative of minimum throughput difference for each trial. The results are sorted in ascending order.

$T_{online}$  for *online* and  $T_{selfish}$  for the *selfish* strategy. Then the minimum client throughput difference, shown in Figs. 8, 9, and 10, is calculated by using  $diff = T_{online} - T_{selfish}$ . These figures show that, even though the selfish protocol is allowed to consume more time, our strategy is more likely to perform better in terms of maximizing the minimum client throughput.

In the *online* strategy, since every client only needs to run our association once, the following clients in the future will not affect the behaviors of current associated clients. Meanwhile, for the *selfish* protocol, the unexpected new clients can easily break the current equilibrium into an unstable state, which will interrupt the usage of users. Thus, the *online* is more practical and less-intrusive. From the figures, it is shown that ours can, despite not knowing who will come to join the network, reduce the performance downgrade for the client who has the minimum throughput.

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we consider the problem of AP association in WLAN. We present theoretical analysis of the performance of two commonly used AP selection protocols, and propose an online algorithm with a provably good competitive ratio. The association protocol based on this algorithm is implemented on the real testbed in a light-weight way. We evaluated our scheme by a combination of implementation on commodity hardware and extensive simulation, demonstrating its performance in practice.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank all reviewers for their helpful comments. This project was supported in part by US National Science Foundation grants CNS-0721443, CNS-0831904, CAREER Award CNS-0747108, CNS-0626240, CCF-0830289, CNS-0948184, and CNS-1117412.




Fig. 9. Simulation result for 20 clients and 6 APs within  $90 \times 90$ . The simulation repeated 30 times. Each bar is the representative of minimum throughput difference for each trial. The results are sorted in ascending order.




Fig. 10. Simulation result for 30 clients and 9 APs within  $150 \times 150$ . The simulation repeated 30 times. Each bar is the representative of minimum throughput difference for each trial. The results are sorted in ascending order.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Azar, J. Naor, and R. Rom, "The Competitiveness of On-Line Assignments," *J. Algorithms*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1995.
- [2] V. Mhatre and K. Papagiannaki, "Using Smart Triggers for Improved User Performance in 802.11 Wireless Networks," *Proc. Fourth Int'l Conf. Mobile Systems, Applications and Services (MobiSys)*, 2006.
- [3] A.J. Nicholson, Y. Chawathe, M.Y. Chen, B.D. Noble, and D. Wetherall, "Improved Access Point Selection," *Proc. Fourth Int'l Conf. Mobile Systems, Applications and Services (MobiSys)*, 2006.
- [4] K. Sundaresan and K. Papagiannaki, "The Need for Cross-Layer Information in Access Point Selection Algorithms," *Proc. Sixth ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conf. (IMC)*, 2006.
- [5] S. Shakkottai, E. Altman, and A. Kumar, "Multihoming of Users to Access Points in WLANs: A Population Game Perspective," *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Comm.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1207-1215, Aug. 2007.
- [6] T. Korakis, O. Ercetin, S. Krishnamurthy, L. Tassioulas, and S. Tripathi, "Link Quality Based Association Mechanism in IEEE 802.11h compliant Wireless LANs," *Proc. RAWNET*, 2005.
- [7] H. Wu, K. Tan, Y. Zhang, and Q. Zhang, "Proactive Scan: Fast Handoff with Smart Triggers for 802.11 Wireless LAN," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2007.
- [8] A. Mishra, M. Shin, and W. Arbaugh, "An Empirical Analysis of the IEEE 802.11 MAC Layer Handoff Process," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Comm. Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 93-102, Apr. 2003.
- [9] I. Ramani and S. Savage, "SyncScan: Practical Fast Handoff for 802.11 Infrastructure Networks," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2005.
- [10] M. Lu and J. Wu, "Localized Access Point Association in Wireless LANs with Bounded Approximation Ratio," *Proc. 17th Int'l Conf. Computer Comm. and Networks (ICCCN)*, 2008.
- [11] H. Han, F. Xu, C.C. Tan, Y. Zhang, and Q. Li, "Defending against Vehicular Rogue AP," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2011.
- [12] F. Xu, C. Tan, Q. Li, G. Yan, and J. Wu, "Designing a Practical Access Point Association Protocol," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2010.
- [13] G. Judd and P. Steenkiste, "Fixing 802.11 Access Point Selection," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Comm. Rev.*, vol. 32, no. 3, p. 31, 2002.
- [14] S. Vasudevan, K. Papagiannaki, C. Diot, J. Kurose, and D. Towsley, "Facilitating Access Point Selection in IEEE 802.11 Wireless Networks," *Proc. Fifth ACM SIGCOMM Conf. Internet Measurement (IMC)*, 2005.
- [15] I. Papanikos and M. Logothetis, "A Study on Dynamic Load Balance for IEEE 802.11b Wireless LAN," *Proc. Eighth Int'l Conf. Advances in Comm. and Control (COMCON)*, 2001.
- [16] Cisco System Inc. "Data Sheet for Cisco Aironet 1200 Series," 2004.

- [17] S. Suri, C. Tóth, and Y. Zhou, "Selfish Load Balancing and Atomic Congestion Games," *Algorithmica*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 79-96, 2007.
- [18] I. Milchtaich, "Congestion Games with Player-Specific Payoff Functions," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 111-124, 1996.
- [19] E. Even-Dar, A. Kesselman, and Y. Mansour, "Convergence Time to Nash Equilibria," *Proc. 30th Int'l Conf. Automata, Languages and Programming*, pp. 502-513, 2003.
- [20] K. Mittal, E. Belding, and S. Suri, "A Game-Theoretic Analysis of Wireless Access Point Selection by Mobile Users," *J. Computer Comm.*, vol. 31, pp. 2049-2062, 2008.
- [21] M. Cesana, I. Malanchini, and A. Capone, "Modeling Network Selection and Resource Allocation in Wireless Access Networks with Non-Cooperative Games," *Proc. IEEE Fifth Int'l Conf. Mobile Ad Hoc and Sensor Systems (MASS)*, 2008.
- [22] Y. Bejerano, S.-J. Han, and L. Li, "Fairness and Load Balancing in Wireless LANs Using Association Control," *Trans. IEEE/ACM Networking*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 560-573, June 2007.
- [23] R. Murty, J. Padhye, A. Wolman, and B. Zill, "Designing High Performance Enterprise Wi-Fi Networks," *Proc. Fifth USENIX Symp. Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, 2008.
- [24] R. Chandra, P. Bahl, and P. Bahl, "MultiNet: Connecting to Multiple IEEE 802.11 Networks Using a Single Wireless Card," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2004.
- [25] S. Kandula K.C.-J. Lin, T. Badirkhanli, and D. Katabi, "FatVAP: Aggregating AP Backhaul Capacity to Maximize Throughput," *Proc. Fifth USENIX Symp. Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, 2008.
- [26] Y. Wang, Y. He, X. Mao, Y. Liu, Z. Huang, and X. Li, "Exploiting Constructive Interference for Scalable Flooding in Wireless Sensor Network," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2012.
- [27] D.B. Shmoys and E. Tardos, "An Approximation Algorithm for the Generalized Assignment Problem," *Math. Programming*, vol. 62, pp. 461-474, Dec. 1993.
- [28] J.K. Lenstra, D.B. Shmoys, and E. Tardos, "Approximation Algorithms for Scheduling Unrelated Parallel Machines," *Math. Programming*, vol. 46, pp. 259-271, Feb. 1990.
- [29] D. Luo, X. Zhu, X. Wu, and G. Chen, "Maximizing Lifetime for the Shortest Path Aggregation Tree in Wireless Sensor Networks," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 1566-1574, 2011.
- [30] G. Matthew, *802.11 Wireless Networks: The Definitive Guide*, 2002.
- [31] X. Zhu, Q. Li, W. Mao, and G. Chen, "Online Vector Scheduling and Generalized Load Balancing," Technical Report WM-CS-2012-01, 2002.
- [32] I. Caragiannis, "Better Bounds for Online Load Balancing on Unrelated Machines," *Proc. 19th Ann. ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2008.
- [33] <http://read.cs.ucla.edu/click/>, 2013.
- [34] <http://madwifi-project.org/>, 2013.
- [35] A. Raniwala and T. Chiueh, "Architecture and Algorithms for an IEEE 802.11-Based Multi-Channel Wireless Mesh Network," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2005.
- [36] Y. Zhang, Q. Li, G. Yu, and B. Wang, "ETCH: Efficient Channel Hopping for Communication Rendezvous in Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks," *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2011.



**Fengyuan Xu** is working toward the PhD degree in the Department of Computer Science at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. His research interests include mobile systems, energy efficiency, wireless networks, and security and privacy. He is a member of the IEEE.



**Xiaojun Zhu** received the BS degree in computer science from Nanjing University, Jiangsu, China, in 2008. He is currently working toward the PhD degree from Nanjing University. His current research interests include RFID systems, smartphone systems, wireless sensor networks, and vehicular networks.



**Chiu C. Tan** received the PhD degree from the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, in 2010. He is an assistant professor in the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. His research is in the area of cyber security, and his current research interests include cloud computing security, smarthhealth systems, and wireless network security (mainly 802.11, RFID, and sensor networks). He is also the director for the NSF/DoD REU Site program at Temple University. He is a member of the IEEE.



**Qun Li** received the PhD degree in computer science from Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. He is an associate professor in the Department of Computer Science, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. His research interests include wireless networks and embedded systems, including pervasive computing, cognitive radio, wireless LANs, mobile ad hoc networks, sensor networks, and RFID systems. He received the US National Science Foundation Career award in 2008. He is a member of the IEEE.



**Guanhua Yan** received the PhD degree in computer science from Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, in 2005. From 2003 to 2005, he was a visiting graduate student in the Coordinated Science Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is now working as a research scientist in the Information Sciences Group (CCS-3) at Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico. His research interests include cyber-security, networking, and large-scale modeling and simulation techniques. He has contributed about 50 articles in these fields.



**Jie Wu** (F'09) is the chair and a Laura H. Carnell Professor in the Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Prior to joining Temple University, he was a program director at the National Science Foundation and distinguished professor at Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton. His research interests include wireless networks, mobile computing, routing protocols, fault-tolerant computing, and interconnection networks. His publications include more than 600 papers in scholarly journals, conference proceedings, and books. He has served on several editorial boards, including *IEEE Transactions on Computers* and *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*. He is the recipient of 2011 China Computer Federation Overseas Outstanding Achievement Award. He was the general cochair for the IEEE MASS 2006, the IEEE IPDPS 2008, and the IEEE DCOSS 2009 and was the program cochair for the IEEE INFOCOMM 2011. He serves as the general chair for the IEEE ICDCS 2013. He was an IEEE Computer Society distinguished visitor and the chair for the IEEE Technical Committee on Distributed Processing. Currently, he is distinguished speaker of the ACM and a fellow of the IEEE.